

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-20, and 22-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-8, 10-20, and 22-31 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 8, 11, 20, 24, and 25 have been amended. The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 8, 11, 20, 24, and 25, can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0024], [0025], and [0032].

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, and 11, to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome thereby.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 20 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without acceding to the Office Action's position, in order to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended the original Application to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome thereby.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent Claim 20

Claims 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,673 B1, issued to Bookman et al. ("Bookman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 20, as amended, contains the following limitations:

20. A computer-readable storage medium comprising:
first instructions, executable on a first computer system, configured to execute a first command of a first business application, wherein the first command is represented by a first command block;
second instructions, executable on a second computer system, configured to execute a second command of a second business application, wherein the second command is represented by a second command block; and
a common data structure defining the first command block and the second command block, wherein the first command block and the second command block are inbound to a web server, and
the common data structure comprises
an execute element having a path attribute indicating a location of an object manager,
a command element nested within the execute element and having a value attribute indicating a name of a command, wherein the command element represents a predefined query, and
one or more argument elements nested within the command element, each argument element having a name attribute indicating a name of an argument for the command, the one or more argument elements being from a set of argument elements comprising an argument element configured to indicate a response markup format, an argument element configured to indicate whether the response should include user interface elements, and an arguments element configured to identify a transform to be applied to output.

(Emphasis added). Applicants submit that Bookman fails to teach or contemplate, at the very least, “an argument element for indicating whether the response should include user interface elements.” Applicants submit that the cited passages of Bookman fail to disclose any options allowing for the inclusion or exclusion of indicated user interface elements.

The Office Action cites the following passage of Bookman as purported disclosure of the claimed argument element:

If the object is an HTML file, a GIF file or other files supported by Web browsers, Web server executable 202 retrieves and returns object 205(1) or 207(1) to Web Browser 201.

Bookman, 4:6-8. This passage explains how the web server in Bookman may return an HTML file according to what is specified in the object request received by the web server. *See* Bookman, 3:61-4:13. In other words, this passage is discussing how to format output data. However, the format of data is entirely different from how a user interface will present that data. Two files may be in HTML format, yet the files can look completely different when rendered on a web browser. How data looks and is presented to a user relates to the user interface. The fact that a file is in HTML format has nothing to do with how the content of the HTML file is displayed. This is to say that an HTML file is capable of presenting the look and feel of information in an endless variety of different ways, yet the file is still in HTML format.

Thus, the look-and-feel provided by user interface elements is unrelated to the particular way in which data is formatted. Because the cited passages of Bookman merely discuss the formatting of output data into an HTML format, it cannot be said that Bookman teaches or suggests, “an argument element for indicating whether the response should include user interface elements.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Bookman fails to teach or suggest the disclosure of all the limitations of independent claim 20, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Independent Claim 24

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Bookman in view of Hallberg et al., “Using Microsoft Excel 97,” published by Que Corporation, copyright 1997 Que Corporation (“Hallberg”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 24, as amended, contains the following similar limitation to independent claim 20: “an argument element for indicating whether the response should include user interface elements.” Hallberg, correctly, is not cited against this limitation, and thus Hallberg cannot cure the deficiencies of Bookman against this limitation. Thus, for reasons similar to those distinguishing claim 20 from Bookman, Applicants submit that independent claim 24 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Independent Claims 1, 8, and 11

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 25-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,831,609, issued to London et al. (“London”), in view of Hallberg. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the following limitations:

1. A method comprising:
providing information relating to a business application in a server system,
comprising
receiving a request, wherein
the request is configured to cause the business application to
execute a command of the business application,
the command is represented by a command block,
the request comprises an indication of a user interface element to
be returned,
the user interface element is represented by the command block,
the command block is defined by a data structure comprising
an execute element,
a command element, and
an argument element, and
the command element represents a predefined query;

generating a data element by causing the business application to execute the command;
generating the user interface element, wherein
the user interface element is configured according to the argument
element; and
sending a response comprising the user interface element and the data element.

(Emphasis added). Amended independent claims 8 and 11 contain similar limitations. Applicants submit that the cited passages of London, Bookman, and Hallberg, at the very least, fail to teach or suggest, “generating the user interface element, wherein the user interface element is configured according to the argument element.” Applicants submit that the cited passages of London fail to disclose any options relating to the configurability of user interface elements. Neither Bookman nor Hallberg are cited for the teaching of this feature.

The Office Action cites the following passage of London as purported disclosure of “user interface element” limitation:

More specifically, when the program receives a paint message (step 435, YES PATHWAY), the program requests the rendering of the character string “Hello” in the center of the displayed window (step 440).

London, 6:24-28. In particular, the Office Action purports that the character string “Hello” is a configurable data set. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, and 11, to more clearly address distinguishing features of the claimed invention. The amended claims recite, “generating the user interface element, wherein the user interface element is configured according to the argument element.”

London is directed toward providing a local view of an application running on a remote computer system. *See* London, Abstract. The example “Hello” program in London cited by the Office Action shows how the “Hello” program on a remote computer system can be seen on a local computer system. This is to say that London is focused on providing a remote graphical user interface – allowing a user on a local computer to interact with the GUI as if the user were on a remote computer. *See* London, Abstract.

However, London does not disclose anything pertaining to a way to modify what elements of the GUI on the remote computer will be sent to the local computer. This is because London is only focused on a way to allow a user remote access to an application running on a remote computer. Allowing remote access to a computer application is unrelated to configuring the user interface of the computer application.

With respect to the idea that a character string may be considered configurable data, it is important to note that there is a clear distinction between data to be displayed and how the data is displayed. This is to say that while a GUI may display any random character string, the character string to be displayed does not affect the elements of the GUI. The same “Hello” character string may be displayed in an infinite variety of GUIs (a green window with orange text; a semi-transparent window with hidden menu buttons). In other words, the data content and the elements of the GUI are distinct and independent of each other.

Thus, whether or not London’s system may display a variety of character strings in the remote application does not mean that London allows for the configurability of the GUI which displays the character strings. This is to say that London does not allow for the configurability of user interface elements. By contrast, the claimed invention recites, “generating the user interface element, wherein the user interface element is configured according to the argument element.” The claimed invention separates data from user interface elements and any interpretation of the claims that ignores this difference would be ignoring claimed elements of the invention.

Certain distinctions between data content and user interface elements can be illustrated in the following manner. In this example, London’s system is connected to a second remote system. It is then assumed that the second remote system also implements a version of the “Hello” application, *except with a different graphical user interface*. In this case, the second remote system implements a user interface with a different variety of menu options, buttons and color scheme (generally, a significantly different look-and-feel). In such a case, the user would assuredly find having to interact with two disparate mechanisms presenting comparable information in visibly different manners highly distracting, even disorienting. This disorientation would occur despite the fact that both “Hello” applications would be displaying the same data.

Such ease-of-use issues can be addressed by employing a system according to the claimed invention. The claimed invention provides the ability to specify the use of user interface elements, in a consistent manner, when interfacing an internal business application (IBA) with an external business application (EBA), and in particular, with multiple EBAs. The consistency provided by the claimed invention (by allowing the IBA to control the user interface elements employed) allows the IBA system to integrate the outputs from multiple EBA systems within a user interface having a uniform look-and-feel.

Bookman and Hallberg, correctly, are not cited as disclosing anything pertaining to the “user interface elements” limitation of the claim 1. Thus, neither Bookman nor Hallbert is capable of curing the deficiencies from which London suffers. Thus, neither Bookman nor Hallbert, taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1, 8, and 11.

Independent Claim 25

Independent claim 25 contains a limitation comparable to the “generating the user interface element, wherein the user interface element is configured according to the argument element” of claims 1, 8, and 11. In further distinction, claim 25 recites the following language:

when the argument element indicates to return at least one user interface element,
generating the at least one user interface element to be returned;
and
sending a first response to the client system, wherein the first response comprises the at least one user interface element and the data element; and
otherwise, sending a second response to the client system, wherein the second response comprises the data element and the second response does not include the user interface element.

This limitation describes the configuration of the response to be returned according to what is indicated by the argument element. As noted earlier in the claim, “the argument element indicates the user interface element.” This is to say that the argument element

indicates the user interface element to be returned by the integration system. Thus, at least this limitation of claim 25, pertaining to the configurability of the user interface element, among other limitations, is not shown, taught or suggested by the cited references. For at least reasons similar to those presented above for claims 1, 8 and 11, claim 25 is allowable.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither London nor Bookman nor Hallberg, alone or in any combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 11, and 25, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5084.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099